

**COCLJ AUTOMATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING – November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2007**  
**HELENA, MONTANA**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Chairperson Judge Larry Carver  
Lisa Mader, Montana Supreme Court Admin. Office  
Judge Gregory P. Mohr  
Judge Scott Wyckman  
Karen Nelson, Court Administrators Office  
Sheri Bishop, Gallatin County Justice Court  
Judge Johnny Seiffert  
Sharon Skaggs, Yellowstone County Justice Court

**MEMBERS PRESENT BY PHONE CONFERENCE**

Claudia Anderson and Steppen Wirth, Full Court Trainers  
Barbara Pepos, Richland County Justice Court/Sidney City Court

**MEMBERS PRESENT BY VISION NET**

Thelma Keys-Nicol, Kalispell Municipal Court

**MEMBERS NOT PRESENT**

Judge David Ortley

**GUESTS PRESENT**

Judge Michelle Snowberger

Meeting was called to order by Chairperson Larry Carver at 10:10 A.M.

**APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 7<sup>TH</sup>, 2007 MINUTES**

Minutes of September 7<sup>th</sup>, 2007 were approved as submitted.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

No public comments.

**CHANGE REQUESTS**

Judge Snowberger made some changes to the Change Requests 1 through 13. Some of the changes were as simple as correcting typos and one change had to be made after a discussion with Steppen. The current change request #1 dealt with Traffic Violations – no appearance required, and No bond, all bond types – except cash. The current overdue gives them a letter, giving them an additional 15 days to appear, on the 16<sup>th</sup> day a Bench Warrant and simultaneously the Driver's License is suspended.

## CHANGE REQUEST #1

Judge Snowberger is asking that there be a separation from no bond posted or surety bond posted. She is asking for Full Court to automatically generate a Bond Forfeiture Notice.

Judge Snowberger is grandfathered in under the Overdue Processing rules, but stated that she would be willing to go to the standard overdue processing system, if it worked better for her. Currently, the overdue processing in her court is not working properly.

Judge Carver stated that there are courts using the Standard Overdue Processing at this time. They are Great Falls Municipal Court, Yellowstone County (both JP and City), Justice Court in Great Falls, and also Mineral County JP, and Superior City Court. Judge Carver asked Lisa if other courts have asked for these changes to the standard overdue processing program. Lisa said no, there had not been.

Judge Snowberger reiterated that she was talking about traffic violations where **no appearance** is required, where the defendant has failed to appear. The current setup is the same whether or not they have posted a bond. Judge Snowberger is asking that for the times they have posted a surety bond and do not appear in court, a bond forfeiture notice is generated by the overdue processing program.

Judge Snowberger read a response from Steppen on the problem and it was noted that most courts do not use the bond forfeiture notice generated by overdue processing, but have chosen to send the bond forfeiture notice manually. She stated that her overdue processing cannot distinguish between defendants who have posted a surety bond and those defendants who have No Bond posted. Judge Snowberger said that if the bond forfeiture does not go out **within 10 days** after the defendant's appearance date, then she cannot go after the Bail Bonding Company. Judge Snowberger believes that the importance of having Overdue Processing is that the system does the work for you. Steppen added that overdue will not put the bond amount on the documents. Karen Nelson said that a change request may need to be made to JSI to add the bond amount to the document.

Judge Snowberger said when cash bond has been posted on a **non-appearance required** violation, the court can elect to have the fines and fees assessed and convert that bond, without sending a bond forfeiture notice.

Sheri Bishop advised that their court sends out the bail bond forfeiture notice within the **10 days** after a non appearance by the Defendant, but they do not actually forfeit the bond until the 90 days has expired. Judge Snowberger asked this question during the Conference in Butte and learned that if the Defendant failed to appear on the appearance date, she had **10 days** in which to send the forfeiture notice to the Bail Bond Company. Judge Snowberger is still asking that at the time the Warrant is issued, that the Notice of Bond Forfeiture be generated.

Sharon Skaggs wondered if this could be done as an add-on to the Bench Warrant form. Steppen said that could be done. Judge Snowberger said she did not want this notice to be generated in cases where there is no bond. Sharon further advised the committee that her clerks manually take care of this step, due to the fact her judges do not agree on how it should be handled.

Judge Wyckman said there would be a separate step where a query would look for a situation based on a surety bond being posted. He asked if this would be fairly easy to accomplish, or will this cause a great deal of programming. Lisa said that it will not be a \$10,000.00 change; it would be a change to the overdue setup, which would be extensive and time consuming to the staff.

Judge Wyckman advised that if the change was accepted, it would change the standard overdue setup, not just Judge Snowberger's setup. Judge Snowberger advised that she felt the change needed to be done statewide. Judge Wyckman advised that if the committee granted the change, it would be done statewide. Judge Snowberger said that the committee has always advised her that if a judge wants a change to the overdue processing setup, and it is a reasonable request, then the change will be made. Judge Snowberger said that was what she was told every time she was at the meetings.

Judge Wyckman said that his understanding was that you lived with what you got, or if you wanted a change, then your court must go to the standard overdue setup. Judge Carver reiterated that the grandfathered courts were locked in. If those courts requested a change in overdue, they were required to go to the standard setup. Judge Snowberger disagreed with that statement.

Steppen said that due to their District Court implementation, he could not guess when a change request like this could be made to overdue processing. If Steppen had the time, he guessed it would take 2 to 3 days to make the change. Steppen also said that when the new system was imported into Judge Snowberger's system, it would first delete everything that was there. Judge Snowberger said she would prefer it that way. Steppen said that if they change the steps now and it is already on step 2, now step 3 is something else, then it will continue through, right or wrong. Judge Snowberger talked to the trainers about deleting the overdue processing table, so it would go back to starting brand new. She went on further to state that even if her court converted to the standard overdue setup, it would not work properly.

Lisa said that if they delete one table, there are other tables tied to it, and this may remove everything. Steppen said they would have to delete everything in the overdue history tables. Judge Snowberger inquired if the full court staff could accomplish this. Lisa said they would have to run a test, before they actually did it in her court. Steppen said that if they clean out the overdue history, it would start all of Judge Snowberger's cases over again. Judge Snowberger understood that and said that was preferable to starting in the middle. Further, when she had access to the tables, she changed them quite frequently and she knows the amount of work involved.

Judge Seiffert wondered why Belgrade is even using the Overdue Processing program, since it causes so many problems. Sharon Skaggs stated that overdue processing is a huge benefit to their court in Yellowstone County. Judge Wyckman stated that the concerns presented here are valid, but he believed the committee made it clear that the policy was made due to the lack of Supreme Court staff. If they just worked on the 10 courts that were grandfathered in, they would not be able to meet their other obligations.

Sharon Skaggs said that when they receive surety bonds, the clerks use the Reminder feature on Full Court and make note of when the Defendant is to appear and when the Notice of Forfeiture must go out to the Bail Bonding company.

Judge Seiffert asked Judge Snowberger why she was using 16 days as the time frame to forfeit the Bail Bond. Judge Snowberger said that the standard overdue set up was giving the defendant the additional 15 days. She noted that after 3 days of non-appearance, overdue generates a letter granting them an additional 15 days to appear before the court. Judge Snowberger does not grant the Defendant 15 days, she only grants them 10 days, then the forfeiture notice goes out. Judge Snowberger will go with the committee's decision regarding the number of days, whether 10 or 15, but she does want overdue to generate the Bond Forfeiture Notice.

Judge Snowberger advised that she has a case where a defendant received an Expired Registration violation and failed to appear, therefore a Warrant of Arrest was issued. This Defendant posted the bond through a surety company, and then she failed to appear again. Judge Seiffert asked if she was talking about failure to appear on an Arrest Warrant. Judge Snowberger said she understood this, but due to the type of case, it is a traffic violation where no appearance is required.

Karen Nelson stated that a history of overdue processing might be of interest at this point. Overdue processing was included in Version IV of Full Court and that version was necessary to connect the court to the Central Repository. The staff of the Supreme Court set up overdue. The overdue processing setup turned out to be very complicated, didn't have a standard going out, and the staff was more reactionary than proactive in the system. Karen said that there is a hold on installing any more courts on overdue, because there needed to be a standard setup. Karen said this committee is entirely willing to take a new look at overdue and make adjustments when they are needed. The Supreme Court is currently operating with a small staff, trying to meet the deadline to install Full Court in the District Courts. The jury program is with the District Court installation as well. The other issue is how to get the standard overdue processing setup to the courts that have asked for it.

Judge Carver said that some of the larger jurisdictions using overdue are not having issues with it. For the committee to make a change when this program is still in the testing stages, would not benefit everyone. Judge Snowberger said she was asked to submit her changes to the committee and she believes that was the proper procedure.

## CHANGE REQUEST #2

Judge Snowberger said that #2 is essentially the same, this is a **must appear** and she is asking that there be separate processes from when they have posted a bond and failed to appear. Judge Snowberger said the standard sends out a bond forfeiture notice, but she wants it to send the warning notice, bond forfeiture notice, but when no bond posted, send a warning notice and go to the Warrant. She is asking for a separate process from posting bond and not posting bond. Judge Snowberger believes that warning notices need to be sent on all cases. She is asking that the bond forfeiture notice step be moved to after the driver's license suspension step.

Sharon Skaggs is wondering if step 1 and step 2 could be the same. Judge Snowberger agreed that Step 2 would have to come up to Step 1. Sharon Skaggs felt that her judges would not want a warning notice in this situation, but would go straight to a Warrant.

Lisa Mader stated she does not deal with overdue processing a lot, but if the committee looked at the standard document which was handed out, where Judge Snowberger asked for two different steps, there are 2 separate processes there. One is for must appear all bonds and must appear – no bonds. Judge Snowberger said the change is needed to make sure defendants get their warning notice about the DL suspension and when the bond is posted that the bond forfeiture notice goes out.

## CHANGE REQUEST #3

Judge Snowberger addressed change request #3, which is **Failure to Appear, Traffic Violation** and **statute required court appearance**. The committee members said that mandatory appearance would be DUI's, Driver's license suspended, Habitual Traffic Offender and there are others as well. She is asking for a change from when bond is posted and when there is no bond. The bond forfeiture notice is only generated when a bond has been posted. Judge Snowberger is asking for an additional 16 days to appear, because that is when the defendant gets his notice about the DL suspension, and that after 16 days, then the Bench Warrant, license suspension and bond forfeiture notice goes. Judge Snowberger felt that if some courts want to immediately go to a Warrant they could, but she believes the notice of DL suspension must be included.

## CHANGE REQUEST #4

Judge Snowberger addressed change request #4, Title 45 codes, **no appearance required**, non Fish, Wildlife & Parks and non-ordinance violations. Judge Snowberger is asking for the same steps regarding bond forfeiture. Judge Snowberger believes that she is not statutorily authorized to suspend driver licenses on 45 codes. Judge Carver stated that the judges have not come to an agreement on this issue and the committee wrote a letter to the Driver Improvement Bureau but there has been no response to date.

## CHANGE REQUEST #5

Judge Snowberger is asking that overdue give the Defendant a warning notice before the Warrant is issued. Also, she is asking that overdue generate a bond forfeiture notice, after the warning notice. This is **failure to appear**, criminal cases and **court appearance**

**required.** She also noted that she does not believe she can suspend a driver's license in this case.

#### **CHANGE REQUEST #6**

Judge Snowberger is asking that the DL suspension part be taken out, as again she does not believe she can suspend the DL on Title 45 cases.

#### **CHANGE REQUEST #7**

Judge Snowberger requests two modifications to the overdue set up regarding Fish, Wildlife & Park violations. Her court does not have these kinds of violations, but she feels it is the same scenario, giving the warning notice and the same change regarding whether there is bond posted or no bond posted, as far as the bond forfeiture notice.

#### **CHANGE REQUEST #8**

Again this request is the same as #7.

#### **CHANGE REQUEST #9**

Judge Snowberger stated that request #9 deals with City Ordinances and seat belt violations. Her change request again is to break out whether they have posted bond, or have not posted bond. She deals with many city code violations, which end up going to a Warrant. The bond is put at \$500.00, as she believes that amount is proper when the defendant has kept ignoring the warning notices sent. Judge Snowberger says her bond on a non-appearance on a seat belt violation is usually \$100.00.

#### **CHANGE REQUEST #10**

Judge Snowberger advised this deals with ordinances where an **appearance is required**, as in the case of a dog bite and there might be restitution ordered.

Judge Carver noted there might be another problem with overdue in cases where municipalities have made their ordinances non-criminal, such as Bozeman did recently. The City Attorney from Bozeman was informed about this meeting, but he did not attend.

#### **CHANGE REQUEST #11**

**Failure to pay** – Judge Snowberger does not issue warrants on failure to pay cases, as the cases go to collections. The City of Belgrade will not provide the funding for her court to obtain the collections module from Full Court. She is asking that 3 days after the money is due, they are issued a failure to pay letter which gives them a warning about their DL. If no payment then license suspended and they receive a Collection Notice.

Judge Mohr stated that defendants get a notice about the consequences when they sign a time pay report, so he was not sure they need another notice. Judge Snowberger believes that the Pyette case requires a notice. Judge Mohr believes the time pay agreement is clear and they should not amend that time pay agreement and give them another 15 days to pay.

Judge Snowberger stated currently there is a failure to pay letter. She is asking that in addition to that letter, there is a collections notice as well. Sharon Skaggs said that the collections notice is included in the defendant's warning letter when a court uses the collection module.

#### **CHANGE REQUEST #12**

Judge Snowberger got a letter from Steppen that there is no way to deal with restitution in overdue. She is withdrawing this request.

#### **CHANGE REQUEST #13**

Judge Snowberger said there are no steps in overdue when the defendant has **failed to comply**. She believes her court may be the only one using this particular part in overdue.

Steppen stated that fail to comply is not set up in overdue, because there is generally no *complete by date* given when defendant is sentenced to the ACT program, or counseling. The counselors determine when the defendant will complete the program, based on the defendant's individual needs. Steppen said that the other courts using the standard overdue processing setup do not use this part.

Judge Snowberger uses *complete by dates*, such as a DUI when she orders that the ACT program must be completed within 5 months. If the defendant must continue in his treatment, then she continues that time as they are in compliance. Judge Snowberger also orders in her Domestic Violence cases that the anger management counseling be completed within 5 months. If a defendant has not completed in that time frame, then she orders them to come back into court and advise why they are not completed. She also keeps close track of community service agreements and attendance at AA meetings. Overdue processes if there is a *complete by date*.

Judge Carver said he remembered the discussion on this issue earlier and oftentimes a failure to comply comes to the court from a Petition to revoke, and the committee did not want the court to be handling these automatically when the city or county attorney needs to prosecute.

Judge Snowberger does use the contempt statutes and she would like Full Court to generate a suspension of the driver's license on those cases. Judge Snowberger tracks her defendants all the way through the process.

Judge Snowberger will redo her requests and make sure that the steps requested are correct, as to what the committee talked about. She said she would do this and add a new revised date to the change requests, so that the committee knows they are the newest version.

Judge Seiffert asked if any of these changes will require a change by Full Court JSI personnel. Karen Nelson said that the only program change she heard is if the bond amount could appear on the bond forfeiture notices. So, that is the only change that they would ask JSI to make. Steppen advised that the merge codes for the bond window do

not work with overdue processing, because they are not only used for criminal cases but they are used in civil cases and that is where overdue “**chokes**”.

Judge Seiffert suggested the committee not go forward on these changes until we know the time factor involved from the Supreme Court staff. The initial comment about cleaning out overdue in Judge Snowberger’s program and redoing it would probably take about 3 days.

Judge Carver believes the committee needs to decide if some of these modifications need to be done. He wants input from the other courts that are currently using the standard overdue processing setup.

Lisa said before they would go into anyone’s overdue and clear it, they would want to test that procedure, so as not to cause harm to all the information currently entered in Full Court. It was noted by Karen Nelson that there are not many problems coming out of the courts that are using the standard overdue processing setup. The problems come when a change is made. Karen believed that when a court requested a change, they should go to the standard setup.

Judge Mohr would like Judge Snowberger to finalize her change requests and to get comments from the courts currently using the standard setup. Motion was made by Judge Mohr to this, seconded by Sheri Bishop, question, and the motion passed by the committee.

Judge Carver advised that he wants Steppen and Claudia in attendance in person at the next meeting. They know what the courts are doing, so they are vital to the meetings on this issue. Lisa said that she can obtain cost estimates from JSI on the change requests in time for the next meeting.

#### **NEXT MEETING DATES AND TIMES**

After some discussion, Judge Carver scheduled the next meetings on December 13<sup>th</sup> and December 14<sup>th</sup>. **December 13<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 A.M.** would be reserved for the members working on the **OOP issues**. **December 14<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 A.M.** would be the **full Automation Committee meeting**.

Meeting adjourned for lunch at 12:10 P.M. The meeting was called to Order by Judge Carver at 12:30 P.M.

#### **CHANGE REQUESTS TO FULL COURT**

Lisa handed out additional requests for changes to the Full Court program. One of the requests involved Orders of Protection and the fact that you could not key in the number of days before the order expired. This has been changed in the new Version V. Judge Ortley requested that he be allowed to populate the date the order expires and then the program would populate the number of days it is effective. Judge Ortley was not at the meeting and it was decided that Lisa should talk to him first about this change request.



Lisa advised the committee that a change request to add a *race box* on the citation entry screen was made by the Motor Vehicle Department. JSI has been contacted for a quote on this change to the citation entry screen. Judge Carver advised that that change request was tabled by this committee; due to the fact the courts do not have this information on the citations that are filed. Thelma Keys-Nicol made a request to have “*hearings*” added to the party history window. Lisa needs to get a quote from JSI on this change request. The next change request came from Linda Chinn of the Ravalli County Justice Court who wanted a change to the Civil Judgment report. She requested that the party’s addresses be added to the Civil Judgment report.

Judge Wyckman and Judge Seiffert stated that someone comes into their court and goes through their civil docket; they do not print a report for them. Sharon Skaggs does not believe that any information from an Order of Protection would be pulled and put on this Civil Judgment report. Judge Carver asked Lisa to get a quote from JSI on this issue.

Judge Carver said if a change was made to the statute table and we could enter the MANS # in Full Court, then the courts could generate a disposition form. Karen Nelson stated she would get into that issue later when she talked about the Broker system.

#### **FISH, WILDLIFE & PARKS RESTITUTION**

Judge Carver then moved on to the issue of Fish, Wildlife & Parks, in which they asked to distribute the restitution money collected directly to them. The law under 87-1-114 states the money **must be remitted to the Department of Revenue**. By issuing a check directly to the Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks the courts are bypassing the law. Lisa said after talking to Claudia she learned that the clerk could print a restitution listing that reconciles that dollar amount and shows the cases involved. The County Treasurer would then have to send that document to the Department of Revenue. The BARS code for remitting this amount to the treasurer is 7453. Restitution sent out on a case by case basis to the Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks is done by entering them as a victim. They are able to identify the case involved, as it is printed on the check.

Judge Mohr stated the Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks should be sent a letter, so that they know why they are no longer getting checks directly from the courts. Judge Mohr believed the courts must follow the law as written. Judge Seiffert made a motion that the law be followed, with a second from Sharon Skaggs. Discussion was made that a letter be attached with the month end reports to the Treasurer, so that they are aware of what the law states regarding Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks restitution. Judge Wyckman asked the committee once this motion is passed, how will all the courts be notified to make the proper change in their procedure. Lisa stated that all the courts can be notified by their office.

Judge Wyckman stated he thought the Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks should be contacted first, before the committee goes forward and contacts all the courts to make a change in how they distribute restitution. Judge Carver believed that the remittance of restitution must be done according to the law. Sharon Skaggs stated that by following the

law and making the remittance to the Treasurer, it would relieve the court of the need to print a check every time restitution is collected on a case.

The Committee was then asked to vote on the motion, which was to follow the law and remit restitution to the Treasurer at the end of the month, so that they may remit it to the Department of Revenue. The motion was passed by the committee. Judge Carver will write a letter to the Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks and send a copy of that letter to the Department of Revenue.

### **ORDER OF PROTECTION FORMS**

Judge Carver said the next item on the agenda was the Order of Protection forms. The statute pertaining to this is 40-15-201 which states a docket number will be given upon the filing of a Petition for an Order of Protection. The committee would send a letter out to the courts stating that when a Petition is filed, please give that document a docket #. The second step would be to go back into the case and enter whether the order was issued or denied.

### **STANDARD CASE TYPES**

Karen Nelson advised the committee that due to the Central Repository, standard case types were developed. However, the Flathead County Justice Court has come up with some new case types and they have been using this method since January. Judge Seiffert advised talking to Judge Ortley and explaining why the case types were created for everyone to use and needed to be consistent for the Central Repository. Judge Wyckman wondered what were the ramifications of changing it back, as his court could certainly use the CV for civil, instead of the case type that they use now. Karen said they may need to wait until January 2008

### **CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CONTEMPT**

Chairperson Carver addressed **civil and criminal contempt charges**, advising there is no statute for civil contempt in Full Court. The criminal contempt code is in Full Court. Judge Carver stated he had a question from a clerk as to how to add a contempt charge, when a person in front of their court was held in contempt, but was not a defendant already entered in the system. Lisa said they could add statutes, one will specify it is a civil contempt and the other will say criminal contempt. Judge Mohr made a motion that the contempt charges be added to the statute table in Full Court, it was 2<sup>nd</sup> by Sharon Skaggs, question. Motion was voted on and passed by the committee.

### **PETITIONS TO REVOKE**

Judge Carver stated another issue that came up was there is no way to track the Petition to Revoke hearings that are held. Karen Nelson said that it would be possible to go to a case and add a new charge of Probation Violation or Revocation. When the report is printed which shows all the violations the court has filed, it would show all the Probation Violation or Revocations as well. Another way to track this hearing is to not clear the hearings after they have been resulted. The standard setup for most courts is to have the hearings cleared. In Judge Knisely's court they can print a report of all their hearings.

Karen Nelson said this would require them to add it as a charge. Sheri Bishop said that they add the Petitions to Revoke on the charges. Thelma was concerned that this would add another charge to the defendant. Judge Wyckman stated that if you look up a record in his court, you will see all the charges against that defendant, including any contempt charges that he/she has had. Karen Nelson said there is an option in court system values which will delete the hearings once they have been resulted. If that system value is set to Yes, then you cannot get hearing statistics. Lisa said that the clerks have been advised to set their court system value up, so that the hearings are not deleted. Judge Mohr made a motion to address the clerks to not delete the hearings. Judge Seiffert 2<sup>nd</sup>. Question. Motion passed by the committee.

### **EQUIPMENT SECURITY**

Karen Nelson advised the committee that there have been a couple of instances where courts have had their equipment vandalized. In one case equipment was vandalized and in another case it was where the network card was removed from the computer. This is a security issue that the courts must address. These incidents took place in the Cascade City Court and in the Dillon City Court, neither of which is open 5 days a week. Karen Nelson said there were no arrests made in either of these cases.

Karen Nelson said this may not be an automation committee problem, but a letter may be appropriate from the Supreme Court regarding taking care of the equipment provided. She was concerned that the court records were vulnerable as well. Judge Wyckman's question was what is the threat to the integrity of the information on those computers? Karen Nelson said that if the data was stolen, there would be an announcement to the public that the information could be out there. Karen wanted everyone to be aware that not only is the computer vulnerable, but the papers filed in the court are also. Judge Seiffert told one of the judges that it was their responsibility to make sure the office was secure. Judge Wyckman said that perhaps both of these courts should be given laptops. Karen Nelson mentioned the laptop alternative, but one of the judges was not interested. Lisa said that the wireless network cards are a hot item for thieves right now.

### **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Judge Carver then moved on to General Discussion. Sanders County made a request to have their court installed with Full Court. Lisa said they also received a request from the Plains court. Judge Mohr and Judge Carver would be in Sanders County on November 13<sup>th</sup> to provide judge training. Lisa did not have her District Court install schedule with her, but making the best guess it would probably be done in March. Judge Carver would be willing to relay that information to those courts. Karen Nelson would like this training lined up with the District Court. They may add another trainer to get this done. Lisa said it would be Plains City Court and Sanders County Justice Court.

Judge Carver wondered if the Justice Court would be home base for all the training. Lisa stated that it is tough to train 3 courts during one visit. Lisa said the District Court would have to be installed separately. Karen Nelson stated that the trainers would be there for two weeks and the jury module training would involve all the courts. Sanders County does not have any Full Court on their computers right now.

Judge Carver stated they want to advise the judges would they need to do to prepare for the installation of Full Court. Lisa said they need to have all their finances in order before the install.

#### **DRIVER'S LICENSE SUSPENSION WARNING LETTER**

Judge Carver advised the committee that the warning letter regarding driver's license suspensions had been approved by the Commission on Courts of Limited Jurisdiction. Judge Carver wanted to know if they will be automatically installed in Full Court, or what is the method used. Judge Wyckman said that e-mail works well. Karen Nelson said she would check on this for the committee.

Sheri Bishop was not at the last meeting, so inquired about the Brady Firearm indicator issue. Karen Nelson stated that their office received a grant to have that done and that is what the sub-committee of this committee has been working on.

#### **KAREN NELSON – BROKER PROJECT**

Karen Nelson gave an update on the Broker Project, which began March 2005. The first project of this messaging system was the reporting from the Central Repository to the Motor Vehicle Department. Greg Noose supplied new usage numbers to Karen today and since reporting directly from the Central Repository, his department has received 40,000 convictions. That number is growing as Kalispell Municipal court just started reporting electronically. In the month of October, there were over 300 transactions to the Department of Motor Vehicles.

Karen Nelson, along with the Department of Justice and Department of Corrections believe that the Broker system may be the architecture needed to bring all the information together. Karen Nelson advised that the notice to victims, as per the required notification statute, is being looked at and possibly developed over the next couple months. Judge Carver stated while he and Karen Nelson attended a national conference on technology, he found it interesting that other states were going to follow their lead. Karen Nelson stated that every state wants a common case management system. They learned at the conference that in the State of Michigan there are 57 different case management systems operating. She stated that once the District Courts are reporting, the Broker can send judgments to the crime victims, to the County Attorney and to Law Enforcement. Sharon Skaggs wondered if this would take the place of the import and export module of Full Court.

Judge Wyckman spoke with the Captain of the Montana Highway Patrol and they are getting closer to using e-citations. Karen Nelson said that first you will see the Montana Highway Patrol citations, but sometime later you will see the local agencies participating. Karen Nelson said that Great Falls Municipal court is using a program called New World, which allows the import and export of information from the court to the law enforcement agency.

Karen Nelson stated that she met with David Blade, who heads up the ID Bureau. The MANS # is an arrest numbering system. The more critical number for electronic reporting of dispositions is the SID #. The SID# is the number that the defendant gets when he/she is fingerprinted. This is a number that is generated from the State records system for that person. You will see that prosecutors will start using the SID # on the Information form when it is filed in District Court. This number stays with the person throughout his/her lifetime and could be verified through fingerprints. Now about 90% of the fingerprints are obtained electronically.

Judge Carver inquired if there was a way of having Full Court generate the dispositions for the MANS forms, instead of typing them up separately on a typewriter. Karen inquired if the MANS # is in the merge codes. Judge Carver felt it could be done as long as we had the MANS#. Lisa said she knows there is a field for the MANS#, but she would have to check into the rest of it. You cannot use a "need prompt" when printing out multiple reports.

Thelma Keys-Nicol said that she wanted the committee to know that she was withdrawing her one change request, as she attended the JSI Conference in Denver and got her answer to the problem there.

Motion to adjourn was made and seconded, question, with all members voting in favor. Chairperson adjourned the meeting at 2:10 P.M.

Minutes submitted by: Barbara Pepos, member